

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended. These claims have been amended to clarify that the legacy systems comprise at least one of a loop facility assignment control system, a loop maintenance operations system, a mechanized loop testing system, a secure network element contract server, a mechanized time reporting system, and a work activity statistical sampling plan, the legacy transactions comprise completing data fields related to the multiple operations, and the voice module accesses a stored separate vocabulary for each of the pages for selecting and performing the multiple operations utilized for generating the legacy transactions on the legacy systems. Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs 0018, 0033, 0041, 0042, and 0049 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson (US 6,023,684) in view of Giangarra et al (US 6,101,472, hereinafter “Giangarra”).

Applicant’s Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicants and the Examiner was held on May 24, 2006 to discuss the rejection of the claims in view of the cited references Pearson and Giangarra. Amendments were discussed to overcome the cited references including clarifying the types of legacy systems which are utilized and the legacy transactions which are performed. Furthermore, a clarification of the vocabulary used with the speech recognition application was discussed as being a

vocabulary for selecting operations for performing legacy transactions to distinguish it from a general or “dictionary” vocabulary as interpreted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for reciting the features “wherein the speech recognition application has in advance of the user accessing each of the pages, a voice module including a vocabulary for each of the pages corresponding to the multiple operations provided by the protocol server.” As noted above, claims 1, 7, 12, and 16 have been amended so that they no longer recite the aforementioned limitation. Accordingly the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-12, 14, and 16-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Giangarra. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a system for permitting a user to remotely access data. The system includes a systems interface to a plurality of legacy systems, the systems interface comprising a first server for managing protocol and a second server for generating legacy transactions, and a firewall that protects the first server and the second server, wherein the protocol server provides multiple operations that may be utilized for generating the legacy transactions, wherein the legacy systems comprise at least one of a loop facility assignment control system, a loop maintenance operations system, a mechanized loop testing system, a secure network element contract server, a mechanized time reporting system, and a work activity statistical sampling plan, and wherein the

legacy transactions comprise completing data fields related to the multiple operations; a computer operable by the user to access data from the legacy systems through the systems interface, wherein the computer is programmed with a client application for accessing the systems interface, wherein the client application provides a graphical user interface that has a page for selecting one of the multiple operations provided by the protocol server for the client application, and has a page for each of the multiple operations wherein when an operation is selected the corresponding page is displayed, and wherein the client application is adapted to format requests for information based on user input within one of the pages corresponding to one of the multiple operations; a voice input device coupled to the computer; wherein the computer is further programmed with a speech recognition application for receiving voice input from a user, wherein the speech recognition application is adapted to convert the voice input into data recognized by the client application, and wherein the speech recognition application has a voice module that accesses a stored separate vocabulary for each of the pages for selecting and performing the multiple operations utilized for generating the legacy transactions on the legacy systems.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Pearson and Giangarra fail to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned references fail to disclose legacy systems including at least one of a loop facility assignment control system, a loop maintenance operations system, a mechanized loop testing system, a secure network element contract server, a mechanized time reporting system, and a work activity statistical sampling plan, legacy transactions which include completing data fields related to multiple operations, and a

speech recognition application which has a voice module that accesses a stored separate vocabulary for each of the pages for selecting and performing the multiple operations utilized for generating the legacy transactions on the legacy systems. In particular, Pearson discloses a system which retrieves data from one or more legacy databases coupled to an application service and provides for the updating of these databases which are utilized by financial institutions (i.e., banks) and their customers (see col. 4, lines 3-43). Thus, Pearson fails to disclose a legacy system which includes a loop facility assignment control system, a loop maintenance operations system, a mechanized loop testing system, a secure network element contract server, a mechanized time reporting system, or a work activity statistical sampling plan as these systems are not legacy databases utilized by banks in their computer systems. Pearson also fails to disclose speech recognition application which has a voice module that accesses a stored separate vocabulary for each of the pages for selecting and performing the multiple operations utilized for generating the legacy transactions on the legacy systems. In particular, Pearson merely discloses that a voice response unit may be used to access information in legacy bank databases (col. 1, lines 29-48). There is no teaching or suggestion in Pearson however, of a voice module for accessing a stored separate vocabulary for individual pages (i.e., pages in a graphical user interface) where the separate vocabulary is utilized for selecting and performing the multiple operations utilized in generating the legacy transactions on the legacy systems. Furthermore, with respect to the assertion in the Office Action that providing for a complete vocabulary for a speech recognition system, it is respectfully submitted that, even assuming this assertion to be true, it is not well known to provide a stored separate vocabulary which is utilized for generating legacy

transactions on legacy systems such as loop facility assignment control systems, loop maintenance operations systems, mechanized loop testing systems, secure network element contract servers, mechanized time reporting systems, etc.

The Office Action relies on Giangarra in relation to a voice module including a vocabulary for each of the pages. As discussed in the Applicants' previous response, Giangarra discloses that the vocabulary for a web page is created upon the user accessing the web page such that the vocabulary is created by parsing the mark-up document of the web page to find all of the links and then creating the vocabulary based on those links. Thus, Gingarra fails to disclose accessing a stored vocabulary for individual pages, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 7, 12, and 16 specify similar features as claim 1 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 8-11, 13-14, and 17-20 depend from claims 7, 12, and 16 respectively. Therefore these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-4, 7-14, and 16-20 should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 29, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093